



CITY OF FALLS CHURCH

DATE: April 9, 2010

TO: John Lawrence, Chair, and Members of the Planning Commission

FROM: Suzanne M. Cotellessa, AICP, General Manager of
Development Services/Planning Director

SUBJECT: **Subdivision and Site Plan # 2010-0202**
350 and 360 S. Washington St.

Following the March 22, 2010 City Council approval of TR10-09 (Attachment 1), a special exception for residential development within mixed use projects at 350 S. Washington St., the development partnership for that project, led by The Community Builders, was joined by Jefferson Investment Group LLC, contract purchasers of 360 S. Washington St., to submit a subdivision action to adjust the lot line between 350 and 360 S. Washington Streets and present a joint site plan for the development of a 66 unit affordable senior apartment building with 1500 square feet of commercial (office) space on the 350 property and the development of structured parking and an office building on the 360 property. Each of these properties is currently subject to a joint site plan with 370 S. Washington Street; that property will retain its current lot and parking and will receive a relocated and improved entrance from S. Maple St. as shown in the submitted site plan. Attachment 2 is a letter from the owners of 370 S. Washington indicating their support of the proposed plan.

The Architectural Advisory Board discussed the proposed projects on March 3 and April 7 and made recommendations that have been and are being addressed by the applicants (Attachment 3). Staff comments provided in Attachment 4 are also being addressed by the applicants, and staff has met with the applicants to begin this process. The site plan and architectural/landscape renderings are provided as Attachment 5. It is expected that revised site plans based on staff comments and further input from the Planning Commission at the worksession on April 12 will be provided to you for your next meeting.

The Planning Commission is being asked for the following waivers with the site plan:

1. Waiver of the 10' landscape strip for the perimeter parking lot landscaping abutting to adjacent properties. The parking lot is on the adjacent property.
2. Waiver of the canopy tree planning requirement in the 10' landscape strip due to existing storm sewer pipes.
3. Waiver of the 100' distance between a commercial entrance and a residential zone.
4. Waiver of the interior lot landscaping requirements for the top tier of the parking deck at 360 S. Washington St.

Additionally, the applicant is requesting a reduction in the required parking for the 350 S. Washington St. affordable senior housing project as discussed during the special exception review process and supported by the parking study reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council during that process. Structured parking for this project will be provided off-site at 360 S. Washington St., as featured in the site plan. Parking for the commercial project at 360 S. Washington St. will meet code requirements. The site plan illustrates an optional third tier of parking on 360 S. Washington St. which may be constructed as public parking pursuant to development and approval of a grant-funded intermodal facility at this location.

The Planning Commission will receive an overview of the project and applicants' initial response to AAB and staff comments at its meeting on April 12.

- Attachments:
1. TR 10-09
 2. Letter from Homestretch, owners of 370 S. Washington
 3. AAB Minutes 3-3-10 (Approved) and 4-7-10 (Draft)
 4. Staff Comments
 5. Site Plan and Architectural/Landscape Renderings

RESOLUTION TO GRANT A SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN MIXED USE PROJECTS UNDER SECTION 48-90 IN A B-2, CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT ON .64 ACRES OF LAND LOCATED AT 350 SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET

- WHEREAS, Chapter 48, "Zoning," of the Code of the City of Falls Church provides for a special exception process within the business districts for a mixture of residential uses and commercial development;
- WHEREAS, an application for a special exception for residential uses in a mixed use project has been submitted for "The Wilden", by CC South Senior Apartments, LP (the Developer) in order to construct a mixed-use development consisting of 66 affordable rental residential apartments for seniors at least 62 years of age and approximately 1,500 square feet of commercial space on .64 acres of property (note that revised parcel following lot line adjustment with 360 S. Washington street and dedication of right-of-way will be approximately .59 acres); and
- WHEREAS, numerous City Boards and Commissions reviewed the special exception(s) at public meetings and provided advisory comments; and
- WHEREAS, the application for this special exception has been referred to the Planning Commission, which held public hearings on February 1, 2010 continued to February 16, 2010, and concluded on March 15, 2010; and
- WHEREAS, the Planning Commission provided its recommendation of approval on TR10-09 that included the voluntary development conditions, on March 15, 2010; and
- WHEREAS, the City Council duly advertised and conducted public hearings to receive public comment upon the request for this special exception on March 22, 2010; and
- WHEREAS, the City Council considered the application, the requirements of Section 48-90 of the City Code, the recommendation of the Planning Commission, comments from boards and commissions, and public comments; and
- WHEREAS, the City Council considered the subject property's unique characteristics and the community benefits derived as a result of the subject property's proposed development, and determined that this particular project is acceptable for this parcel at this time, with the understanding that a similar project might not be appropriate on another parcel; and
- WHEREAS, the City Council considered state law regarding special exceptions, specifically, that special exceptions can be granted by the local governing body subject to conditions pursuant to Code of Virginia Sec. 15.2-2286(A)(3) that allows their issuance "under suitable regulations and safeguards" and that each special

exception case shall rest on its own merits and the uniqueness of each piece of land; and in particular, that the ratio of commercial and residential uses approved herein are unique to this site; and

WHEREAS, the City Council also considered the public interest in improving the subject property as part of the City's affordable housing goals to support redevelopment opportunities that add new affordable housing units in the city and meet specific identified affordable housing needs; and

WHEREAS, the Developer has submitted voluntary development conditions for the proposed special exception development to the City in order to further provide consistency with the City of Falls Church's Adopted Comprehensive Plan and Policies, and primarily the affordable housing goals; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the proposed project has met the primary criteria as listed in Section 48-90(d)(1)(a) of the Falls Church City Code as follows: 1) that the resulting development generally conforms with the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan and Design Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that finds that the proposed project has met the primary criteria as listed in Section 48-90 (d) (1) (d) that the resulting development in which 75% percent or more of its residential units qualify as affordable housing for low and moderate income purchasers or renters; and

WHEREAS, City Council finds that finds that in accordance Section 48-90 (d) (1) (d) the proposed development shall be exempted from primary criteria 2 and 3, although the criteria are still to be considered in the overall analysis; and

WHEREAS, the City Council also finds that the secondary criteria as listed in Section 48-90 (d) (2) of the City Code have also been met; specifically the resulting development does not overburden the existing community facilities; the development provides the important community benefit of senior affordable housing; the development contributes to a vibrant, pedestrian-oriented environment, both on-site and in relation to adjoining properties; the resulting development encourages transit use through its close proximity to Metro bus stops, and the resulting development utilizes LEED criteria in the design of the project; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant has requested a parking reduction through the site plan approval process in conformance with the requirements of Chapter 48 by providing a parking study that supports a reduction in the off-site parking and loading requirements.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Falls Church, Virginia, that the request for special exception is hereby granted and approved in order to allow a mixed-use development consisting of 66 affordable, rental

residential apartments for seniors at least 62 years of age and approximately 1,500 square feet of first floor non-profit office, client program, amenity/common space on .64 acres of land subject to the following conditions:

1. The Developers Voluntary Concessions, Terms and Conditions for "The Wilden" dated November 20, 2009 is incorporated herein by reference and marked as Exhibit No. 1; all the terms and conditions thereof shall be a condition for the issuance and approval of the Special Exception; and the City Manager is hereby authorized and directed to execute the Developer's Voluntary Concession, Terms and Conditions on behalf of the City.
2. The project shall be developed in substantial conformance with the Applicant's final preliminary site plan dated March 4, 2010 and architectural renderings dated March 15, 2010, which includes a lot line adjustment with, and provision of structured parking off-site on the adjacent property at, 360 South Washington.
3. The applicant shall request a reduction in the required parking at site plan subject to Planning Commission approval and in no case provide less than .5 spaces per senior affordable dwelling unit nor less than one space per three hundred square feet of the minimum 1500 square feet of leasable office space.
4. No Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued for any portion of The Wilden project at 350 S. Washington Street until the structured parking appurtenant thereto and all pedestrian and vehicular accesses to it are completed, elevators are operational, and final inspections have been conducted on the structured parking at 360 S. Washington. However, in the event that the construction of The Wilden is complete and otherwise eligible for issuance of a certificate of occupancy by the building official with the assent of the zoning administrator, but the appurtenant portion of the parking structure at 360 S. Washington St. is delayed due to short term unforeseen construction issues, The Wilden may seek approval from the City of a temporary (one hundred eighty days or less), accessible parking solution so that Certificates of Occupancy can be issued for occupancy of 350 S. Washington Street no later than December 31, 2011.

Reading: 01-11-10
Adoption: 03-22-10
(TR10-09)

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the foregoing was adopted by the City Council of the City of Falls Church, Virginia on March 22, 2010 as Resolution 2010-11.



Attached:
Voluntary Concessions

Kathleen Clarken Buschow
City Clerk



Street Falls Church, Virginia 22046

The Community Builders, Inc

F -VOLUNTARY CONCESSIONS, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS

This special exception application addresses the Primary Criterion #4 for a special exception, namely a development in which 75% or more of its residential units qualify as affordable housing for low and moderate income purchasers or renters. As such, concessions which might typically be expected from an applicant may not apply. We propose the following voluntary concessions, which would extend, if applicable, to our successor(s) or assign(s):

1. The residential component of this mixed-use building will be reserved entirely for low and moderate income purchasers or renters. The term for this reservation will be a minimum of 30 years. The intent is to maintain a long-term commitment to affordable housing and to coordinate with the terms of the anticipated financing and equity funding instruments for the project.
2. The residential component will be restricted to housing for older persons as defined in the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 and the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995.
3. A minimum of 1,500 square feet of commercial space will be provided and this space will not be converted to residential space.
4. The Applicant will provide the associated off-site improvements adjacent to the property as shown in the plans submitted with this application.
5. The applicant will meet the intent of the standards of the City of Falls Church Design Guidelines, December 2001, in the manner described in Section D-2 of this application.

6. The Applicant will negotiate in good faith other concessions as reasonably proposed by the City of Falls Church in the course of its review of this Application.

In the approval of this special exception application and in the final wording of voluntary concessions the Applicant requests that the language allow some reasonable modifications in project design and engineering based on the City's review and approval of the permitting plans.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of CC South Senior Apartments, L.P.

CC South Senior Apartments, L.P.,

a Virginia limited partnership

By: **City Center South Housing, LLC, a**

Virginia limited liability company, its

General Partner

By: **The Community Builders, Inc., a**

Massachusetts Nonstock Corporation, its

Managing Member

By: **/E:-----** Name: Rob Fossi Its: Authorized Agent



March 11, 2010

Suzanne M. Cotellessa, AICP

General Manager/Planning Director, Department of Development Services

City of Falls Church

300 Park Avenue

Falls Church, VA 22046

RE: The Wilden Site Plan

Dear Ms. Cotellessa:

Homestretch is aware that The Wilden has an upcoming Planning Commission hearing, and will be submitting their Site Plan to the City today.

Homestretch has reviewed the proposed Site Plan and is in agreement with the proposed relocation of the entrance for our property from S. Maple and the relocation of parking spaces, waterline and storm sewer improvements, and various easements that will need to be granted by Homestretch on our property to allow those improvements to be completed. In addition, based on numerous meetings and communications between the parties the applicants have implemented various designs considerations on their Site Plan and are willing to grant easements to Homestretch that will aid the future redevelopment of the Homestretch property.

Homestretch is confident that all legal documentation for the various easements will be completed prior to Site Plan approval by the City.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Respectfully,

Christopher Fay
Executive Director

Cc: Carol Jackson, John Dapogny, Karen Steen

370 S. Washington St, Suite 400 • Falls Church, VA 22046 • (703)237-2035
www.homestretch-inc.org



CITY OF FALLS CHURCH

**Architectural Advisory Board
March 3, 2010**

SUMMARY NOTES

Agenda Item AAB-2009-2520 The Wilden Site Plan, Affordable Senior Apartments, 350 & 360 South Washington Street (MUNIS #20090816).

The Wilden architects, Wiencek and Associates presented their revised concepts for a senior affordable housing project at 350 S. Washington Street. Butz Wilbern Ltd presented their concepts for a commercial office/retail structure and structured parking at 360 S. Washington St.

350 S. Washington St.

The applicants indicated that they are still working on horizontal patterning and improving the window sizes. They answered questions about the materials on the parking structure on the adjacent property at 360 S. Washington (**greenscreen**® and HardiePanel®) and noted that it should register as part of The Wilden. The Board questioned the parking and loading space dimensions and the constraints of the storm easement with respect to landscaping (at 360 S. Washington). The Board also asked the applicant if a shadow study had been conducted to determine the effects of the proposed development at 360 S. Washington on The Wilden at 350 S. Washington. The applicants indicated that the project will receive the morning sun and that the worst condition will occur around noon during the winter solstice.

The Board asked if there was a below grade level proposed at the Wilden. The applicants explained that the project is a slab on grade. The Board asked about the proposed construction and the applicants indicated that it will be a Hambro system with steel frame (composite structure).

The Board discussed the following features of the revised plan for 350 S. Washington St. and provided comments as noted:

- The project residents' ability to carry groceries from cars to their units is of concern;
- The pedestrian drop-off on Fairfax Street is removed from the front door;
- There should be some landscape design in front with shrubs and plantings at the front door;
- There should be some separation between the units at grade and the adjacent courtyard/plaza;

- The porous paver parking spaces look dropped into the environment...need to establish the edge of the paving to integrate with the landscape;
- Appreciate improvements to front entrance; remain concerned about the plaza space being more of a sidewalk and not looking like it belongs to the building...doesn't look like a place where residents are encouraged to linger;
- There need to be deeper overhangs and the front entrance;
- The large numbers proposed don't work on an unimportant edge...would be better on overhang;
- The elevations are fairly well composed and competent...but seem to lack a sense of joy;
- The top of glazing for lobby levels provides a chance to distinguish it...how can you better treat the upper edge of the fascia condition;
- The brick face of the elevator shaft is plain...consider a circular element at the top of the brick or an identifiable mark at the top of the building element to create a memory when passing by;
- Need to check site lines...what will you actually see coming down Maple?;
- Could the patterns on the cement boards be mimicked in the glazing?;
- How can you distinguish the residential entrance from the retail?
- Consider recessing the service door on Fairfax Street from the front surface of the building at least a foot or two
- What lighting is proposed for the building and plaza area in the evening?
- Noted that the floor of the commercial space is 18" lower in back...accessibility?

The Board then discussed the preliminary concepts for 360 S. Washington St. and provided the following comments:

- The building should acknowledge the street on S. Washington in some way to reinforce the Washington St. edge...address the geometry of the street
- The building and parking garage must be tied together with The Wilden at 350 S. Washington...consider wrapping the retail with a canopy around the corner.
- With respect to the Spandrel Glass panel over the second floor...its blankness doesn't accomplish anything. How about a wrought iron enclosure/metal grille?
- Need to see in context of building at 360 S. Washington
- Site plan would benefit from showing the massing toward S. Washington

*Summary Notes prepared by Suzanne M. Cotellessa, AICP
General Manager / Planning Director
Department of Development Services
City of Falls Church*

Approved as revised per AAB action April 7, 2010 meeting.

DRAFT UNAPPROVED MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Architectural Advisory Board
The Council Chamber
300 Park Avenue
Falls Church, Virginia 22046
Wednesday, April 7, 2010
7:45 p.m.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mr. Emmons called the meeting to order at 7:55 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL:**

Members Present: Mr. Emmons
Mr. Fritsch
Mr. Way
Mr. Earley

Member Absent: Mr. Alexander

Administrative Staff Present: Mr. Dennis Washington,
Senior Zoning Inspector;
Ms. Suzanne Cotellessa, General Manager,
Development Services

3. **PETITIONS:** None.

4. **CONSENT CALENDAR:** None.

5. **OTHER BUSINESS:** None

6. **OLD BUSINESS:** None.

7. **NEW BUSINESS:**

AAB 2009-2520, Site Plan of Falls Church Housing Corporation/The Community Builders at 350 S. Washington St. (The Wilden) and 360 S. Washington St.

Mr. Emmons noted the applicants were present and asked them to sign in for the record.

Ms. Karen Steen of Walter Phillips, Ms. Carol Jackson of Falls Church Housing Corporation, Mr. Jack Wilburn of Butz Wilbern Architects, Mr. Hsien-Yuan Chen of Wiencek Architects and Joe Wetzel of Jefferson Investment Group, Inc. were present for the applicants.

The applicants presented their project revisions based on input they had received from the AAB, staff, and the Planning Commission in March. They indicated that they had revised the landscaping, lighting, pedestrian linkages, building details and materials.

Mr. Emmons asked about the pattern of paving outside the commercial area and its relationship to what is going on down S. Maple St. He indicated that it should be a continuation of the larger City streetscape until reaching the residential area. He indicated that the applicants might consider introducing a sitting planter or similar element that would better integrate with the building; the planter proposed is now centered on the glazing of the commercial space and should step more toward the residential.

Mr. Fritsch said, with respect to the landscaping in the plaza/courtyard area behind the 350 building that a portion of the building

still meets up with the plaza right next to dwelling units. He wondered how it would feel o tenants in the space and if they would need to leave their blinds closed all the time? Discussion then ensued with the applicants regarding the fact that the floor plates of the units are several feet above the plaza so the windows would be higher as well.

Mr. Emmons said that seating elements are shown against the wall and under the windows and that it might help to refine the area of the plaza edge with a brick planter or similar feature to define the space.

Mr. Way concurred and said that such an edge carried over to the stairs descending into the courtyard/plaza would help to terminate the stairs before the edge of the building.

Mr. Earley asked if there was a retaining wall around the two space parking/loading area; the applicant affirmed.

Mr. Way asked about the slopes on the ADA accessible routes and if a walkway/path could be connected between the public pathway and the residential building pathway. The applicant indicated that they have fenced off area with utility boxes and that they believe it's appropriate to keep public and residential paths separate at this location.

Mr. Earley asked about the green roof plantings.

Mr. Emmons said he appreciates the use of similar pavers for the courtyard and the two lower surface parking spaces (marked parking/loading on plans). He suggested the applicant consider redefining this parking area as another kind of plaza that sometimes cars would occupy and shape it sympathetically to the plaza...add a curve, make a space that people might think of using in other ways besides parking at all times. He also asked about the lighting.

Mr. Wilbern indicated that lighting for the 360 building would be dark sky compliant with low bollards.

Mr. Emmons suggested that the lighting should be coordinated between the two buildings.

Mr. Emmons noted that on the overall site plan it seems that the two sidewalks on the outer edges could become minor public ways to cut through the block. How could they be used by residents of The Wilden?

Mr. Way noted on the revised layout at the entrance to S. Washington St. there is a curved walkway and asked if it was concrete. Mr. Wilbern indicated City standard pavers. Mr. Way indicated that with the previous version there were pavers across the drive aisle at 360 S. Washington and more sidewalk in front of the lobby that lends itself to being more of an entrance. He added that pavers across the drive aisle would give notice to drivers that pedestrians would be present. Mr. Way indicated that we should not try to prevent the flow of pedestrians to the bus stop but rather provide pavement treatments to communicate with drivers.

Mr. Emmons added that immediately by the entrance to the garage at 360 where cars are coming in and out there could be some fencing or other pedestrian barrier...possibly incorporating parts of both schemes (pedestrian accessibility and safety).

Mr. Earley asked if the distribution of parking spaces in the garage had been decided. Mr. Wilbern indicated that the lower level would be all residential. The next level up would be residential and commercial for the Wilden; above that would be public and commercial. The residential would be reserved and clearly marked. The office parking would be closest to the offices.

Mr. Way indicated that he likes the bike rack proposed.

Mr. Emmons notes that the south elevation of the 360 building appears to be getting its own life and that the pylons at the entryway seem large, although the scale might fit if there were also signage on that feature.

Mr. Emmons addressed the orientation of the 360 building to S. Washington St. He appreciates the fact that the applicants provided views down adjacent streets and would like to see the retail space be brought parallel to S. Washington St. Mr. Wilbern indicates that storm sewer infrastructure is in the way. Mr. Emmons said that what disturbs him is that the building is designed to create its own faces and reinforce the frontal face of the building as it moves into the back of the site. He would like to see a move to reorient the building so that the walkway that goes back to The Wilden is very important. He appreciates that there are reasons to locate the building as it is, but wonders if this is ultimately a positive contribution to S. Washington Street. This area contains disparate pieces of land ownership that can't relate to the street edge. He believes this is an important issue that must be raised. He believes that the potential to integrate the small triangular piece adjacent to the site to the east would help connect the building to the street.

Mr. Emmons notes that what is proposed for 360 S. Washington St. is a nice building design that makes the best of a bad situation. However, he wonders why we should accept that. Buildings could be reordered to make S. Washington Street a better urban edge. He remembers other decisions that have been made. There was a time when Broadway could have included Papa Johns...not including it was not in the best interests for the long term design of the City. He believes it is his obligation to bring up these matters and share them with the Planning Commission, to raise them as part of the review. He again stated that he appreciates the design of the building and recognizes that the site plan is challenged.

Mr. Fritsch stated that he appreciates the effort to do something to wrap the corner and acknowledges that. He believes that the height of the entrance portion and the top elements are too large and too high up. He believes that the canopy offers an opportunity to do more than turn the corner.

Mr. Way indicated he likes the grill work for the parking enclosure.

Mr. Earley then spoke with respect to comments on The Wilden building at 350 S. Washington St. He noted that the vegetation plan did not include the plantings on the green overhangs. Mr. Chen, for Wiencek Associates architects, indicated that they are still working on these and proposed them as opportunities for residents to look down at green roof areas; he also indicated that the project needed these green areas to meet stormwater requirements. Mr. Earley asked if they had considered putting an edge around them because if the greenery was not maintained in an ideal way it would not be attractive. He asked the applicant if they had ever done a green roof on a canopy area. Mr. Chen said no. Mr. Wilbern indicated that the City's "Flower Building" has a small green roof on top of the stairs.

Mr. Emmons was concerned about no break in the canopy on Fairfax St. (north elevation). He asked if the applicants had considered changing the canopy between the residential and commercial parts of the building. He noted it was a point of friction between different uses that needed to be resolved.

Mr. Fritsch said that commercial ceilings are usually higher...perhaps the applicant could consider stepping down the canopy over the residential area to differentiate it.

Mr. Emmons indicated that the relationship between the landscape and the front doors was too busy. Instead of curves with grass planting, perhaps the applicant could bring the line out with a place for seating, a bench or wall, to let people come out and look up and down Maple or further down Fairfax St. where it would be quieter. He suggested that they tie in a review of the building edge at the ground and the development of the canopy.

Mr. Emmons indicated that he appreciated that they were still studying the slope at the top of the canopy. Mr. Chen indicated that if too forced, they could end up with a flat canopy, with perhaps a different height for the commercial and residential. Mr. Emmons suggested they might look at turning it ninety degrees toward the street. Mr. Emmons and Mr. Earley discussed the use of the word "The" as part of "The Wilden" sign. Mr. Fritsch indicated that the lettering might be better if more understated...it appears to be too big.

Mr. Way said he appreciates the relocation of the stairwells and introduction of natural light. He also understands the effect of the fire stairs. He is concerned about the large brick façade and that something should be done to break up the expanse such as ornamental banding or a big W or similar feature to dress the edge.

Mr. Emmons indicated that the angled corner commercial area is important and that the walkway beside it makes it even more important to be appropriately glazed. He notes four columns across the front and one in the middle of the space and asked if they could cantilever at the corner. He reflected on a building by Peter Cram at Binghamton University that featured a structural column that ruined the experience...and asked that they address how we can free that corner.

Mr. Frisch commented that the commercial entry is slightly lower than the residential and where does the transition occur inside? The applicant demonstrated where the transition occurs. Mr. Frisch also asked if there was any thought to doing paver treatments across the loading dock and driveway on Fairfax St.

Mr. Way asked about the plantings outside around the Community Room. The applicant indicated that the plantings would be relatively low to make sure that light gets in there.

Mr. Emmons asked why the two chamfered corners at the edge of the community room are at different angles. The applicant indicated on side has a gas fireplace. Mr. Emmons suggested that the two corners should either be symmetrical or more different so that they don't fight with one another.

Mr. Emmons said he appreciates the efforts and improvements since the last time the Board saw the project.

Mr. Fritsch asked about elements such as dryer vents or exhausts that might interrupt the faces, particularly as the brick is cleaner without those elements. He felt it was important to maintain the finish, color, and consistency, especially above the entrance, and that unfortunately louvers would not be pleasing in the brick. Mr. Chen indicated that laundry would be central venting through the roof and that other features would be limited to maintain the integrity of the facades.

MOTION: Mr. Fritsch moved, regarding item AAB 2009-2520, to recommend approval of the application with the following recommendations:

RE 350 S. Washington St.:

Consider incorporating the sidewalk scoring and paving along S. Maple St. with the continuation of the walkway around S. Maple, near the commercial space.

Consider locating the planter between the commercial and residential entrances at the 350 building closer to where the transition occurs between uses.

Consider providing planters in front of the dwelling unit that faces onto the plaza at the 350 building.

Consider softening the shape of the loading space adjacent to the plaza to be more similar to the forms of the plaza.

RE 360 S. Washington St.:

Consider providing pavers across the pedestrian walk at the S. Washington St. vehicular entrance to the 360 building.

Consider reducing the size of the decorative forms at the top of the office lobby.

Suggest that the City consider the timing of the replacement of the below-grade piping along the edge of the 360 building, which may allow the building form to be modified and front directly on to S. Washington St.

RE the 350 S. Washington St.:

Consider introducing a transition in the canopy at the transition between the commercial and residential entrances

Consider introducing more detail to the brick face on the east drive aisle elevations.

Mr. Emmons offered a friendly amendment re the 350 building, accepted by Mr. Fritsch:

Consider providing parking and seating area adjacent to the housing entrance in front of the lobby space.

Mr. Way seconded the motion as amended.

Upon voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

8. APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES: March 3, 2010

Mr. Way moved to accept the draft minutes as amended and Mr. Fritsch seconded. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

9. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:04 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Noted and Approved:

Suzanne Cotellessa

Recording Secretary

The City of Falls Church is committed to the letter and spirit of the Americans with Disabilities Act. To request a reasonable accommodation for any type of disability, call 703.248.5040 (TTY 711).

DATE: April 1, 2010

TO: Sue Cotellessa, Planning Director

FROM: Cyrus Salehi, Civil Engineer /WDH
Engineering & Construction Division

SUBJECT: The Wilden Site, Preliminary, and Subdivision Plans, Submitted
3/22/10 350 & 360 S Washington Street, MUNIS #

The Falls Church Engineering & Construction Division (ECD) developed the following comments through its review of the pre -development plans (Preliminary, Site, and Subdivision plans) submitted to ECD on March 22, 2010.

1. All ROW dedications as well as offsite and on site easements must be recorded prior to the approval of the site plan.
2. Provide additional ROW to include the proposed sidewalk behind drop off (stop bus) area along Fairfax Street.
3. Label dedicated ROW along S. Washington Street on the layout plan.
4. In conformance with the City Center Master Transportation Plan (December 2007), Page 48, improve Fairfax Street to provide access to Annandale Road. This must include continuation of sidewalk on the SW side of Fairfax Street.
5. Provide pavement design for improvement of dedicated ROW in addition to the proposed typical pavement section on sheet C0202.
6. Provide storm sewer easement for the existing structure 12158. The City is disinclined to accept the storm sewer that snakes from this structure upstream to structure number 5 (2, .3, 4, 11398 through 5).
Notwithstanding, we recognize that Structure 2 to Existing structure 12158 carries water from the neighboring site. We would consider accepting the reaches from structure 2 to structure 1 to existing structure 12158. However, the City will not accept storm sewer less than 15-inches in diameter. Moreover, Structure 2 appears too close to the building structure/foundation for the City to accept. A more acceptable location would move this structure west to or even over the property line with a storm water easement to the City necessary from neighboring property.

7. Existing 13 feet storm sewer easement from structure 12713 to 12202 is too small to effectively allow the City to maintain this 48-inch pipe and must be widened to 20 feet.
8. On the Landscaping Plan, show sight distance and remove all landscaping in the sight distance.
9. On landscape detail, Sheet C-1209, use Victor Stanley FC-12 type receptacles for refuse and recycling.
10. Provide sight distance plan and profile for the entrance on Fairfax Street.
11. Clearly delineate accessible route from drop off space into the building entrances on layout plan, sheet C-0401, and on grading plan, sheet 0501. Slopes of accessible route must be labeled with arrow. Accessible route must be identified by pavement marking. An ADA sheet may be added to include accessible routes, slopes, pavement marking, ADA ramps, and all related construction details for both buildings and parking structure in conformance with ADAAG.
12. For CG-12, Detectable Warning Surface, for HC ramp, the city requests installation of a cast iron plate, which is the City's current installation standard..
13. Minimum curve radii for entrances must be 25 feet, and provide VDOT's standard details.
14. Show the pavement markings for pedestrian crossing on both entrances.
15. Provide stop and no left turn signs at the egress from the site onto S. Washington St.
16. Provide stop signs at the egress from the site onto S. Maple Avenue and Fairfax Street.
17. All traffic signs must be in conformance with Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and must be located within City's ROW or public easements.
18. On utility plan, Sheet C-0402, show the size and direction of flow on storm sewer pipes in coordination with storm sewer profiles and computations.

19. Following comments relate to E&SC plans, narrative, and details.
 - Add legend for limit of clearing and tree protection to the Erosion Control Legend.
 - Safety fence must be placed to enclose the construction site with gates at CE.
 - The limit of clearing on phase one must be minimized for installation of E&SC measures only such as SAF, SSF, IP, CE, TP, and staging area.
 - Show location of portable sediment tank on phase one.
 - Provide maximum flow rate for the proposed portable tank on sheet C-0606
 - Provide tree protection and staging area on phase one.
 - Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System VPDE permit. is required.
 - On Sheet C-0605, replace unclear and unreadable soil map with a copy of the required geotechnical report and reference the erosion potential and critical slopes based on the geotechnical report.
 - On the E&SC narrative" permanent stabilization paragraph" the inspection authority statement shall change from Arlington County to the City of Falls Church.
 - Provide detail for safety fence on Sheet C-0606
 - Provide dust control measures on E&SC plan. (MS-2)
20. Provide manufactures specification for proposed porous pavers
21. Provide green roof maintenance specification on the plan.
22. On BMP computation for 350 S. Washington St, 3.39% Phosphorous removal should be coordinated with line 3(6) and may change from 3.39 %to 4.42%.
23. DES requests the developer consider installing cisterns to collect runoff from roof impervious area and parking deck and use collected water for irrigation.
24. Minimum acceptable storm sewer pipe in storm sewer easement is 15"RCP. Type III.
25. Add existing inlets into the storm inlet computation table on Sheet C-0801.
26. Why is structure 7 is not directly connected to the existing structure # 11903? Consider relocating structure 7 to eliminate Structure #6.
27. Show size and location of proposed landscaping on sight distance profiles.
28. Provide locations and construction details for irrigation system for landscaping along Fairfax Street within dedicated ROW.
29. Provide street lightning plan, specification, and details in conformance with comment #2

30. Would you please enlarge Luminaire schedule on photometric plan (Sheet EL-1) to be more readable?
31. Label property lines and 7 feet beyond the property line to determine that spillage of lights are
not exceeding 0.1--1.0 footcandles measured at any point seven feet beyond the property line.
32. Final approval of subdivision plat will be subject to final approval of size and locations of storm
sewer pipes and ingress/egress easements.
33. Street lights must comply with the Dominion Power standards, type Dayform Decorative Colonial, located within the City's ROW or public easements. Street light must be accepted by Dominion Power for maintenance prior to the occupancy permit.
34. Submit following plans and reports for review by engineering staff
 - Traffic Impact Analysis, TIA
 - Parking Study
 - Geotechnical report.
 - Revised street light plan.
 - Maintenance of Traffic Plan (MOT) prior to construction

DATE: March 24, 2010
TO: Sue Cotellesa, Planning
FROM: Rodney Collins, Public Utilities
SUBJECT: 350 and 360 South Washington Street

I have completed the review of the plans and plat for the above referenced project prepared by Walter L. Phillips, Inc., dated April 4, 2007. Outlined below are my comments.

1. Revise all labels for the 6" sanitary sewer lines as a sanitary lateral.
2. The 6" sanitary sewer lines for the proposed buildings will be considered private laterals and the maintenance of these lines will be the responsibility of the building owner. At the owner's discretion and per the current plumbing code the proposed manholes may be replaced with clean outs.
3. For the connection to existing manhole in South Maple Avenue, add a note to connect by core drilling a hole and utilizing a flexible boot assembly (see Standard Detail S 5.0).
4. Eliminate Manhole A and connect to existing sanitary sewer with a wye connection.
5. The new water line from South Maple Avenue shall be an 8" line. Adjust all labels accordingly.
6. For the new water line connection in South Maple Avenue include an 8" x 6" reducer.
7. Provide alternative location of the fire hydrant located adjacent to the proposed 350 S. Washington Street building such that it is not located in the sidewalk and access to the fire hydrant is not impacted by parking.
8. Connect the existing 4" service line for 370 S. Washington to the new 8" water line. This connection shall be done with an 8" x 6" tee, 6" gate valve, and 6" x 4" reducer.
9. Add the following note: The contractor shall coordinate the temporary water outage of 370 S. Washington for the new connection with the building owner and the City of Falls Church.
10. On the profile for the sanitary sewer connection for 350 South Washington Street provide an outside drop connection for the connection to the existing sanitary sewer manhole.

11. On the easement plat provide a tabulation of the area of water line easement to be granted and vacated.
12. Provide an easement plat for the water line to be located on the 370 South Washington Street property.



CITY OF FALLS CHURCH

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 29, 2010
TO: Sue Cotellessa, Planning Director
FROM: John C. Boyle, Zoning Administrator
SUBJECT: Wilden / 350 & 360 S. Washington
Site Plan / Subdivision

The following will serve as my comments on the proposed site plan and subdivision:

Subdivision

Appears to comply with Zoning, no comments.

Parking

1. The plan proposes a loading space measuring 12' x 28' at 360 S. Washington. City Code requires the dimensions to be at least 10' in width and 30' in depth (Sec. 48-934).
2. Ensure all loading spaces are free of overhead obstructions to a height of 15'.
3. The existing site plan for 370 S. Washington requires 47 parking spaces. Several of these are lost and replaced during construction. Provide a parking plan or off-site parking agreement that maintains 47 parking spaces for 370 S. Washington for the duration of the construction.
4. The proposed residential parking for 350 S. Washington reflects 0.5 spaces per unit and provides 33 spaces. Code requires 1.5 spaces for 1 bedroom units and 2 spaces for 2 bedroom units, which amounts to 101 spaces required. This is a 66% parking shortfall. Provide data that the intended occupant vehicle usage, and use of public transportation, will justify such a reduction. A miscalculation on this single point will render the site dysfunctional as to parking.
5. The parking tabulations for both 350 and 360 S. Washington assume that there will be no restaurant use. Given the 1:100 ratio necessary for restaurant use, this plan should note that restaurant uses are precluded from this site due to parking.

General

1. The proposed new vehicle entrance on the S. Maple frontage requires a Planning Commission waiver, being within 100 feet of an R district (48-938(d)).
2. Ensure all transformer installations are not in a yard abutting a street.

DATE: April 1, 2010

TO: Suzanne Cotellessa, Planning Director/General Manager, Development Services

FROM: Wendy Block Sanford, Principal Planner
Elizabeth S. Perry, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: The Wilden
Proposed development at 350 and 360 S. Washington Street
Site plan and subdivision application review

Site Plan

1. Site plan pages should be renumbered for easier reference.
2. Update Special Exception information on the cover sheet (C-0101).
3. Add a copy of the development plan approved with the special exception to the site plan, labeled and listed in the table of contents, accordingly.
4. The project name listed on the cover sheet (C-0101) does not match the project name on the rest of the site plan pages. It appears that "The Wilden" name only applies to the residential building. This is one site plan, so assign a single project name to the project.
5. Why is there information regarding 370 S. Washington Street in this site plan when it is not subject to the site plan? For example, there are references to its parking, the property and its owner listed under "Owner of Record" on Sheet C-0201. Based on a note on Sheet C-0401, it appears restriping of parking spaces may be proposed for the 370 S. Washington St. property. Perhaps a note should be added with the site tabulation details to clarify. Does that work require an authorized signature of the property owner on this site plan?
6. The details listed in the "note" on the cover sheet (which indicates that the site plan is two properties with different owners and that the proposed improvements for each site is the responsibility of the respective property owner) is contrary to the language and intent of the owner statement and agreement required by Sec. 48-1137(4) of the Code. This note should be removed from the site plan and for the condition to be addressed via a private party agreement.
7. Add Code citation for the "article" referenced in Public Works Note 9 on the cover sheet (C-0101).
8. RPC numbers must be verified. The RPC numbers provided for the subject property could not be found in the City's real estate assessment database.
9. Loading space for 360 S. Washington, as listed on Sheet C-0201 does not meet the dimensions required by the Code: a loading space 10 feet in width by 30 feet in length is required; a loading space 12 feet in width by 28 feet in length is proposed.
10. There is no City-adopted streetscape plan for the area subject to the site plan application. Will the City, therefore, want to accept responsibility for the irrigation system, as proposed on Sheet C-0202 of the site plan?

11. Sheet C-0201 should be more appropriately labeled. It is currently labeled “Construction Notes” but contains the parking and other site tabulations, details which may be difficult to find if using the table of contents as a guide.
12. After the subdivision application is approved, the site plan must be updated with the approved subdivision plats.
13. It appears that the page numbering for the subdivision exhibits are not correctly numbered.
14. Sec. 48-1137(7) requires the site plan to contain existing widths and master plan widths of streets adjoining the tract (right-of-way and pavement widths), but the site plan provides “variable width” of the streets.
15. Dimensions of the existing and proposed buildings are required by Sec. 48-1137(11) of the Code.
16. Street addresses labeling the proposed 350 and 360 S. Washington St. buildings will clarify references made to those buildings and properties throughout the site plan.
17. Parking
 - a. Square footage of the lobby for 360 S. Washington Street in the parking calculation is required since parking is calculated on gross floor area.
 - b. Why is parking for 370 S. Washington Street shown in the Parking Tabulation?
 - c. How will the parking be regulated between the different uses on the site? Parking for the residential may not be shared. Will parking passes be issued, will spaces be reserved and signed for specific uses? How will visitor parking for the residential building be provided? How will the provision of parking spaces be managed for the residential building?
 - d. Based on how parking will function (see comment 17c., above) should separate parking tabulations be provided, or should the parking tabulations be provided in one table? (It appears that the parking tabulations should be combined.)
 - e. Are the two surface parking spaces along the drive aisle to the garage for a specific use? The location of these parking spaces seems unsafe given that traffic on the drive aisle may not be expecting a traffic conflict with parking spaces tucked on the side of the drive aisle; visibility seems limited for both drivers leaving the parking garage and drivers pulling out of the surface parking spaces, as well as from the curve of the drive aisle; and the location of only two parking spaces outside of the parking garage makes for an awkward parking plan/layout. The two surface spaces should be eliminated or relocated. See comment 19 below.
18. These two parking spaces are labeled “loading pervious pavers” on the landscape plan. Is this a specific type of pervious paver, or does this imply that these spaces would be used for loading?
19. There appears to be better locations for loading than the area proposed in the front of the building at 350 S. Washington Street. Possible alternate locations include areas on the side of the building, with access from the drive aisle
20. Bike storage internal to the office building, residential building, and/or parking structure being should be provided and shown on the site plan.
21. Locations of bicycle racks must be shown on layout sheet of site plan. Currently, one is shown on the layout sheet, but others are shown on landscape plan.
22. Do the architectural elevations provided in the site plan reflect the current proposal? Color renderings should be added to the site plan file.

23. It does not appear that trash enclosure and screening information is provided. Site plan should also include the screening (door) to the loading/trash room proposed for the residential building.
24. Internal building floor layouts (showing the location of stairs, elevators, dwelling unit location, etc.) for each level/floor of the proposed buildings must be provided.
25. There appears to be grade changes between approximately 8 and 10 feet between levels of the parking garage. Ramps between floors must comply with Sec. 48-933(b)(5) of the Code, which states, "Ramp design in multilevel garages shall provide for slopes mild enough to insure driver visibility of the pavement at all times."
26. Add legend to Sheet C-1205, "Materials Layout."
27. Waiver 1 must be more specific in identifying where on the site this waiver would apply and the extent of the waiver being requested.

Subdivision

1. Does the proposed name of the subdivision, which appears to be "Resubdivision of Parcel 1 and 2, Office Management, Inc." comply with Sec. 38-34(2) of the Code, which requires the names of new subdivisions or renaming of subdivisions to be submitted to the historical commission?
2. Name of subdivider is required on the preliminary plat, per Sec. 38-58(1) of the Code.
3. The preliminary plat contains information regarding proposed conditions, which appears required by the Code only when a combined preliminary and final plat is prepared. Proposed conditions should be removed from the preliminary plat.
4. Building setback lines on the preliminary and final plats, as required by Sec. 38-58(4) and Sec. 38-59(7), respectively, are not shown.
5. Owner's certificate on Sheet 1 of 2 of the final plat for a property owner is pending.